

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-7, 16, 18, 21-25, and 27-31 will remain pending in this application. Claims 8-15, 17, 19-20, and 26 were previously canceled. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by the present amendment. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter added to claims 1, 16, and 25 is supported in the Specification at least at paragraphs [0046]-[0049].

Claims 1-7, 16, 18, 21-25, and 27-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,795,071 (“Tracey et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,634,127 (“Cloud et al.”).

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1-7, 16, 18, 21-25, and 27-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Tracey et al. in view of Cloud et al. The rejection is understood to be based in part on the premise that Cloud et al. teaches the following limitations, which are not disclosed in Tracey et al.:

“wherein the business process comprises different business processes;”  
“matching the related service entities based on the service metadata;” and  
“combining the related service entities into a context entity that is a single entity derived from one or more service entities.”

Further, Tracey et al. is cited as teaching the limitation “determining dynamic actions available on the related service entities based on the classification of the availability of the one or more actions performable in connection with the related service entities, the available dynamic actions comprising an indication of whether a state change is available on each service entity within its corresponding different business process” at column 29, lines 47-51, column 31, lines 3-18, and more generally columns 31-35.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claims 1, 16, and 25 have been amended to recite the limitation “wherein the classification of the availability of the one or more actions comprises one of a universally available classification in which the action can always be performed, an optimistically available classification in which the action is

available subject to a specified condition, and an available according to a rule classification in which the action is available only in compliance with at least one specified condition.”

By contrast, while Tracey et al. is cited as disclosing the limitation “determining dynamic actions available on the related service entities based on the classification of the availability of the one or more actions performable in connection with the related service entities, the available dynamic actions comprising an indication of whether a state change is available on each service entity within its corresponding different business process,” it is not seen where Tracey et al. discloses the particular classifications recited in claims 1, 16, and 25. In particular, while column 29, lines 47-53, of Tracey et al. mentions that “each option available for the particular type of contact made is listed within the menu tree,” there is no mention of those options being classified as either universally available, optimistically available, or available according to a rule, and no disclosure of availability being subject to certain rules or conditions.

Thus, Tracey et al. and Cloud et al., considered individually or in combination, fail to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Tracey et al. in view of Cloud et al. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and are also patentable over Tracey et al. in view of Cloud et al. at least by reason of this dependency.

Claim 16 recites similar limitations to those recited in claim 1 and is therefore also patentable over Tracey et al. in view of Cloud et al. Claims 18 and 21-24 depend from claim 16 and are patentable over Tracey et al. in view of Cloud et al. at least by reason of this dependency.

Claim 25 recites similar limitations to those recited in claim 1. In addition, claim 25 recites further limitations beyond those recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 25 is patentable at least for the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1. Claims 27-31 depend from claim 25 and are patentable over the prior art of record at least by reason of their dependency.

Based at least on the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the currently pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record and requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**DOCKET NO.:** 301410.1 / MSFT-1948  
**Application No.:** 10/648,507  
**Office Action Dated:** October 7, 2008

**PATENT**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: March 9, 2009

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439